

***Remarks***

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application, with 1, 6, and 16 being the independent claims. Applicant notes that Claims 6-21 have been allowed; the present reply therefore addresses Claims 1-5 only.

Based on the following remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider all outstanding objections and rejections, and that they be withdrawn.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

The Examiner has rejected Claim 1 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,446,192 ("Narasimhan"). The Examiner argues that this reference discloses a system for providing a client with access to remote graphics rendering resources at a server. The Examiner further argues that this reference discloses an application at the server. In particular, the Examiner cites Narasimhan, column 3, lines 13-25 and column 8, line 64 through column 9, line 20. Narasimhan, however, fails to disclose all the features of Claim 1. The applet of Narasimhan, which the Examiner analogizes to the application of Claim 1 (see page 3, paragraph 5D of the Office Action), is programmed into the network interface chip memory, but then downloaded to the client (Narasimhan, column 9, lines 6, 7, and 12). At the client, the applet is executed and renders an image of a control panel on the client's screen (column 9, lines 12 and 13). Hence, the applet does not execute at the server, and therefore does not receive commands from the client at the server. Rather, the applet of Narasimhan executes at the client. Moreover, the only rendering described by Narasimhan takes place at the client (column 9, lines 11-13). Narasimhan therefore does not disclose rendering resources at a server as specified in

Claim 1. In addition, Narasimhan fails to disclose any kind of remote rendering control system at the server; as discussed above, the only rendering resources described by Narasimhan are present at the client. Narasimhan therefore fails to disclose all the features of Claim 1. For at least these reasons, Narasimhan fails to anticipate Claim 1 of the present invention.

Claims 2, 4, and 5 of the present invention are also rejected by the Examiner as being anticipated by Narasimhan. These claims depend from Claim 1, and therefore each includes the features of Claim 1. Because Narasimhan fails to disclose all the features of Claim 1, this reference likewise fails to disclose all the features of Claims 2, 4, or 5. For at least this reason, therefore, none of Claims 2, 4, and 5 are anticipated by Narasimhan.

Moreover, with respect to Claim 4, the Examiner compares the activation of controls and buttons disclosed by Narasimhan with the modified graphics instructions of Claim 4 of the present invention. Even if it is assumed that such a comparison is valid, Narasimhan fails to disclose the generation of image data by graphics rendering resources on the basis of activations of controls and buttons. Narasimhan also fails to disclose the receipt of image data from a remote rendering control system and the sending of this image data to the client. For at least these reasons as well, Narasimhan fails to anticipate Claim 4 of the present invention.

With respect to Claim 5, the Examiner argues that this claim is anticipated by Narasimhan given that, in the Examiner's view, the java applet of Narasimhan is comparable to the graphics application of the present invention. Claim 5, however, describes a remote rendering control system that receives graphics instructions from a graphics application. Narasimhan fails to disclose any graphics application that

generates graphics instructions for a remote rendering control system. For at least this reason as well, therefore, Narasimhan fails to anticipate Claim 5 of the present invention.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

With respect to Claim 3, the Examiner argues that this claim is rendered obvious by a combination of Narasimhan and U.S. Patent 6,085,247 ("Parsons"). Claim 3 depends from claim 1. The Examiner states his belief that Claim 3 is obvious because Narasimhan discloses the features of Claim 1 while Parsons discloses the features of Claim 3. As discussed above, Narasimhan fails to disclose the features of Claim 1. A combination of Narasimhan and Parsons therefore fails to render Claim 3 obvious. For at least this reason, therefore, Claim 3 of the present invention is not rendered obvious by, a combination of Narasimhan and Parsons.

***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Edward W. Yee  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 47,294

Date: November 13, 2003

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600